

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/910,914	(07/24/2001	Kie Y. Ahn	M4065.0461/P461	M4065.0461/P461 2806	
24998	7590	11/29/2004		EXAMINER		
		RO MORIN & OS	FOURSON III, GEORGE R			
2101 L Street Washington		37		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,, <u></u>	,	- '		2823		
				DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/910,914	AHN ET AL.	
riariosi y riodon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George Fourson	2823	:
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of this application and the same of the s	cation. A proper report can place the application of the caption o	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data was been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensor CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meaning patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE teen which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b			
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth		(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note			
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: So		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	;		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	oroved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:		George Flourson Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2823	~

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's statement in the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 that none of the references relied on in combination is refuted by the statement of the rejections under 35 USC 103 in the office action mailed 8/26/04 contain the argument that the invention of the instant claims, including the named limitations, are suggested by the combination of references relied on. Applicant does not point to a particular limitation missing from all of the references but instead argues the references individually as not containing combinations of recited limitations. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument regarding use of the term "scope". The term scope is synonymous with "obvious" in this context.

Applicant argues that the references relied on address different problems and provide different advantages. However, this does not negate the teachings relied on. Furthermore, if this is an argument that the references are not analogous, all references relied on are directed to formation of Cu conductive layers in damascene processes and are therefor analogous.

Applicant's remaining arguments are arguments against the references individually and are addressed as in the first paragraph above.